



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

PL

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/447,419	11/23/1999	HARUO TANAKA	040894-5507	3789

9629 7590 08/26/2003

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER
----------

SANTIAGO, MARICELI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2879

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Applicati n No.

09/447,419

Applicant(s)

TANAKA, HARUO

Examin r

Mariceli Santiago

Art Unit

2879

--The MAILING DATE of this communicati n appears on the c ver sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  
(a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.  
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,5 and 12.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 6-11.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*Wm 8/22/03*

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendment to claim 5, "such that the pores of the surface of the aluminum oxide layer are substantially free of gases raises new issues and requires further consideration.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amendment to claim 1, "coated by anodic oxidation" is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance because the limitation is directed to a process of manufacturing the device. The Examiner notes that Applicant is claiming the product of an organic EL device including a method (i.e. a process) of making the sealing member, consequently, claim 1 is considered a "product-by-process" claim. In spite of the fact that a product-by-process claim may recite only process limitations, it is the product and not the recited process that is covered by the claim. Furthermore, patentability of a claim to a product does not rest merely on the difference in the method by which the product is made. Rather, is the product itself which must be new and not obvious (see MPEP 2113). Accordingly, it is the Examiner's position that the combination of the Glase and Ohnuma references disclose the claimed device and the rejection presented in the Final Rejection Office Action, Paper No. 13, would still apply.



NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800